Volume 1 | 2015

COMPENDIUM OF ORAL SCIENCE

The Official Journal of The Faculty of Dentistry



UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MARA

ISSN 2489-1102

COMPENDIUM OF
ORAL SCIENCE
The Official Journal of The Faculty of Dentistry

Volume 1|2015
ISSN: 2489-1102

Editorial Board

Editorial Address
Kazi Ahsan Jamil, BDS, PhD
Editor-in-Chief,
Compendium of Oral Science (Compend.Oral.Sci),
Faculty of Dentistry
UiTM Sungai Buloh Campus
Jalan Hospital,
47000 Sungai Buloh,
Selangor, Malaysia.
Tel: +603-6126 6511
Fax: +603-6126 6103
E-mail: kazi@salam.uitm.edu.my

Contents

Original Article

Assessment of Interradicular Spaces for Miniscrew Placement in Class I Subjects

Nagham Al-Jaf *[,1], Rohaya Megat Abdul Wahab[2], Mohamed Ibrahim Abu Hassan[3]

[1]*Centre of Studies for Paediatric Dentistry and Orthodontics,Faculty of Dentistry, Universiti Teknologi MARA Sg. Buloh Campus, Jalan Hospital, 47000 Sungai Buloh, Selangor, Malaysia.*

[2] *Department of Orthodontics, Faculty of Dentistry Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM) 50300 Kuala Lumpur*

[3] *Centre of Restorative Dentistry Studies, Faculty of Dentistry, Universiti Teknologi MARA Sg. Buloh Campus, Jalan Hospital, 47000 Sungai Buloh, Selangor, Malaysia.*

Abstract

Objectives: To assess interradicular spaces of maxilla and mandible in subjects with class I sagittal skeletal relationship as an aid for miniscrew placement. **Materials and Methods:** The study was carried out using cone -beam computed tomography (CBCT) images of 47 adult subjects with class I skeletal relationship. Interradicular spaces were obtained at the alveolar processes from first premolar to second molar at 2 different vertical levels (6 and 8mm) from the cementoenamel junction (C.E.J). **Results:** In the maxilla, the highest interradicular space existed between second premolar and first molar. In the mandible, the highest interradicular space existed between first and second molar. All mandibular measurements were higher than their respective maxillary measurement. Generally, availability of interradicular space increases apically in both arches, but the difference is not significant. In the maxilla, male subjects' measurement were significantly higher at 8 mm level between second premolar and first molar and between first and second molar **Conclusions:** Interradicular spaces in the maxillary and mandibular alveolar spaces are available for miniscrew placement. In both arches, a more apical location provides more interradicular space. However, careful planning is needed to avoid sinus perforation.

Keywords: Miniscrew; Interradicular spaces; CBCT.

Introduction

The use of miniscrews to provide anchorage has become a reliable practice in orthodontic treatment [1-3]. Miniscrews are usually placed in the interradicular space to allow for simple placement and removal procedures, and simple force systems application [4]. However, damaging dental roots, is still a valid concern in the clinical application of these miniscrews [5]. Various anatomical sites have been suggested previously for miniscrew placement [6]. However previous studies were more focused on design , shape and diameter of miniscrews [7, 8], leaving more to be studied on the anatomical assessment of the most commonly suggested sites for miniscrews.

Previous studies on assessment of interradicular spaces and determining the so-called "safe zones" for miniscrew placement, have recommended minimal clearance of 1 mm of alveolar bone around the screw to preserve the health of the periodontium [2, 9]. And since the minis-

*Corresponding to: Dr Nagham Al-Jaf, Centre of Studies for Paediatric Dentistry and Orthodontics,Faculty of Dentistry, Universiti Teknologi MARA Sg. Buloh Campus, Jalan Hospital, 47000 Sungai Buloh, Malaysia.
Email: nagham@salam.uitm.edu.my
Tel: +603-61266460 Fax: +603-61266103

crews used currently have a diameter that range between 1.2-2 mm [9] , it is logical to assume that an interradicular space of more than 3 mm is needed for miniscrew placement [10].

Min et al [11] used three dimensional images (CBCT) to examine the relation between root proximity and the success rate of miniscrew and concluded that root proximity was significantly related to the success rate. A similar conclusion was reached by Kuroda et al [12]. However, Kim et al [13] claimed that root proximity was not a major risk factor for miniscrew success. Nevertheless, root contact by miniscrews should be avoided as this contact is a possible cause for external root resorption [14].

Although previous studies showed that interradicular distance can be influenced by skeletal relationship [10], studies on root proximity mostly pool data from different skeletal relationships. Therefore, the objective of this study was to evaluate interradicular distance in subjects with Class I skeletal relationship as a guide for miniscrew placement.

Materials and Methods:

The sample was retrospectively selected from cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT) scans in the Radiology department of Faculty of Dentistry, University Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM). The images were created using i-CAT unit (Imaging Sciences International, Hatfield, PA). All selected images were taken with the following settings: 120 KVp, 5mA, 4 seconds exposure time and 0.3 mm voxel size. Approval of institutional ethical committee was obtained to collect the data. The following general inclusion criteria were used: age between 20-45 years, no alveolar bone loss, no facial asymmetries, no cleft lip or palate or any craniofacial anomaly, no impacted or missing teeth in the measured quadrant, no history of orthognathic surgery or orthodontic treatment. The following skeletal criteria were used for patient inclusion: subjects had normal mandibular plane angle with SN/GoMe angle, 27°- 37° [15] and sagittal relation Class I with ANB angle 1°-3°.



Figure 1: A, Axial view with horizontal reference line bisecting the area between the adjacent roots. B, sagittal view with the horizontal reference line marking (C.E.J).



Figure 2: A, Sagittal view with mandibular interradicular measurement. B, Sagittal view with maxillary interradicular measurement.

The i-CAT Vision software was used to view and reconstruct the three dimensional views, CBCT scans of 47 subjects were included in this study (21 males and 26 females). Subjects mean age was 34.25 years.

Interradicular distance was measured in the alveolar process of the maxilla and mandible from distal of first premolar to mesial of second molar at two different vertical levels (6, and 8mm) from the cementoenamel junction (C.E.J). Areas measured are between first and second premolar (P-P), between second premolar and first molar (P-M), and between first and second molar (M-M).

To orient the area to be measured, the axial view of the software was rotated so that the vertical reference line is at the centre of the two teeth where interradicular distance between them to be measured, and the horizontal reference line is between the two teeth (Fig 1, A). The sagittal view is rotated to orient the teeth roots parallel to each other and the horizontal reference line is used to mark the cementoenamel junction (C.E.J) (Fig 1, B). The interradicular distance then is measured in the sagittal view using the distance tool of the software (Fig 2, A, B). Since previous studies concluded that there is no difference between right and left side measurements of interradicular distance [16] only one side was measured in each alveolar process.

Since all measurement were conducted by one operator, only intra observer reliability was measured. 10 images were remeasured two weeks apart. All data entered into excel worksheet and analyzed using SPSS software version 20.0. Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation), were performed. t- test was used for gender comparisons. Intra –class correlation coefficient was used to assess intra observer reliability. Level of significance was set at $P < 0.05$.

Results

Intra –class correlation coefficient ranged between 0.84-0.95, which shows high intra observer consistency.

In the maxilla, interradicular distance was high-

Table 1: Maxillary interradicular distance (mm)

Cut level	Site	Male Mean	SD	Female Mean	SD	t- test P value
6 mm	P-P	3.42	1.2	3.22	0.8	NS
	P-M	3.83	0.9	3.46	1.4	NS
	M-M	2.6	0.85	2.7	0.7	NS
8 mm	P-P	3.44	0.6	3.4	0.9	NS
	P-M	3.85	0.8	3.6	0.4	*
	M-M	2.55	1.1	2.43	1.2	*

P-P, first premolar-second premolar; P-M, second premolar- first molar;
M-M, first molar-second molar. * P< 0.05; NS, not significant

Table 2: Mandibular interradicular distance (mm)

Cut level	Site	Male Mean	SD	Female Mean	SD	t-test P value
6 mm	P-P	3.7	0.8	3.7	0.7	NS
	P-M	4.1	0.9	3.8	1.2	NS
	M-M	4.4	0.85	4.6	0.7	NS
8 mm	P-P	3.9	0.8	3.5	1.2	NS
	P-M	4.2	1.5	4.2	1.4	NS
	M-M	4.6	1.1	4.2	1.2	NS

P-P, first premolar-second premolar; P-M, second premolar- first molar; M-M, first molar- second molar. NS, not significant

er at 8 mm level in all sites. The highest root distance existed between second premolar and first molar. Male subjects' measurement was higher at all sites, but gender difference was only significant at 8 mm level between second premolar and first molar and between first and second molar. Table 1, shows descriptive statistics of maxillary measurements and t-test result for gender differences.

In the Mandible, interradicular distance was also higher at 8 mm level in all sites. The highest root distance existed between first molar and second molar. Male subjects' measurement was higher at most sites, but the difference was not significant. Table 2, shows descriptive statistics of mandibular measurements and t-test result for gender differences.

Discussion

In our study, only subjects with sagittal skeletal Class I were included as previous research shows that different skeletal pattern shows different bone dimensions. Also all sample subjects had normal vertical relation as this is also a previously studied factor that was demonstrated to influence bone dimensions [16].

In this study, the C.E.J was selected as the starting point for the measurements, unlike other studies that used the alveolar crest as a reference point, which could be affected by periodontal problems.

Yang et al [3] stated that in the anterior maxilla, most interradicular distances were not sufficient to accommodate a mini-implant. In this study, only the posterior part of the maxilla and mandible was studied as they offer a wider and more favourable area for miniscrew placement.

In addition, our measurements were conducted using CBCT files, which are more accurate in distance measurements than previous studies, which were conducted using periapical and panoramic x-ray that have magnification errors [9, 10].

Min et al [11]and Kuroda et al [12] concluded that root proximity was significantly related to the success rate of miniscrew placement .

Hence avoiding this proximity by knowledge of probable area interradicular distance can increase miniscrews success rate.

Our results confirmed that in the maxilla, the preferred site for mini-implant placement is between the maxillary second premolars and first molars because of the large space and easy accessibility for various orthodontic mechanics. [17]. Authors have studied interradicular distance at various depths from C.E.J [3, 11, 17, 18] in this study we only assessed interradicular distance in the attached gingiva as this placement choice was recommended by previous studies to avoid soft tissue inflammation and sinus perforation in the maxilla [2, 10, 12].

Our results showed that for the mandible the site between the two molars offers a wider root distance for miniscrew placement. This finding agrees with previous studies [11, 19, 20]. In Both arches root distance increase apically but this increase is not of statistical significance.

Miyawaki et. al [21] studied stability after implantation, and suggested that miniscrews move after placement, so one should allow at least 1 mm of distance between the root surface and the mini-screw.

Although our results show generally a higher male mean values for interradicular distance, gender differences in the mandible was not significant, while in the maxilla at 8 mm cut level a significant difference is seen in interradicular distance at two sites, between second premolar and first molar and between first and second molar.

Conclusions

The recommended site for miniscrew placement in the maxilla is between second premolar and first molar. Although a more apical position gives more root distance, it is not recommended to insert miniscrews higher than 8 mm above C.EJ. to avoid soft tissue inflammation and also to avoid sinus perforation. In the mandible, the recommended site is between first and second molar at 8 mm below C.E J.

Acknowledgment

This research was supported by ERGS grant, 5/3(37/2013)

References

1. Hu, K.-S., et al., *Relationships between Dental Roots and Surrounding Tissues for Orthodontic Miniscrew Installation.* **The Angle Orthodontist, 2009. 79(1): p. 37-45.**
2. Poggio, P.M., et al., *"Safe Zones": A Guide for Miniscrew Positioning in the Maxillary and Mandibular Arch.* **The Angle Orthodontist, 2006. 76(2): p. 191-197.**
3. Yang, L., et al., *Quantitative evaluation of maxillary interradicular bone with cone-beam computed tomography for bicortical placement of orthodontic mini-implants.* **American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, 2015. 147(6): p. 725-737.**
4. Laursen, M.G., B. Melsen, and P.M. Cattaneo, *An evaluation of insertion sites for mini-implants.* **The Angle Orthodontist, 2013. 83(2): p. 222-229.**
5. Kuroda, S. and E. Tanaka, *Risks and*

complications of miniscrew anchorage in clinical orthodontics. **Japanese Dental Science Review, 2014. 50(4): p. 79-85.**

6. Ohnishi, H., et al., *A Mini-Implant for Orthodontic Anchorage in a Deep Overbite Case.* **The Angle Orthodontist, 2005. 75(3): p. 444-452.**
7. Ódman, J., et al., *Osseointegrated implants as orthodontic anchorage in the treatment of partially edentulous adult patients.* **European Journal of Orthodontics, 1994. 16(3): p. 187-202.**
8. Klokkevold, P.R., et al., *Osseointegration enhanced by chemical etching of the titanium surface. A torque removal study in the rabbit.* **Clinical oral implants research, 1997. 8(6): p. 442-447.**
9. Schnelle, M.A., et al., *A Radiographic Evaluation of the Availability of Bone for Placement of Miniscrews.* **The Angle Orthodontist, 2004. 74(6): p. 832-837.**
10. Chaimanee, P., B. Suzuki, and E.Y. Suzuki, *"Safe Zones" for miniscrew implant placement in different dentoskeletal patterns.* **The Angle Orthodontist, 2011. 81(3): p. 397-403.**
11. Min, K.-I., et al., *Root proximity and cortical bone thickness effects on the success rate of orthodontic micro-implants using cone beam computed tomography.* **The Angle orthodontist, 2012. 82(6): p. 1014-1021.**
12. Kuroda, S., et al., *Root proximity is a major factor for screw failure in orthodontic anchorage.* **Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop, 2007. 131(4 Suppl): p. S68-73.**
13. Kim, S.-H., et al., *Cone-beam computed tomography evaluation of mini-implants after placement: Is root proximity a major risk factor for failure?* **American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, 2010. 138(3): p. 264-276.**
14. Shinohara, A., et al., *Root proximity and inclination of orthodontic mini-implants after placement: Cone-beam computed tomography evaluation.* **American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, 2013. 144(1): p. 50-56.**
15. Ozdemir, F., M. Tozlu, and D. Germec-Cakan, *Cortical bone thickness of the alveolar process measured with cone-beam computed tomography in patients with different facial types.* **Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop, 2013. 143(2): p. 190-6.**
16. Fayed, M.M.S., P. Pazera, and C. Katsaros, *Optimal sites for orthodontic mini-implant placement assessed by cone beam computed tomography.* **The Angle orthodontist, 2010. 80(5): p. 939-951.**
17. Kim, S.-H., et al., *Evaluation of interdental space of the maxillary posterior area for orthodontic mini-implants with cone-beam computed tomography.* **American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, 2009. 135(5): p. 635-641.**
18. Holmes, P.B., B.J. Wolf, and J. Zhou, *A CBCT atlas of buccal cortical bone thickness in interradicular spaces.* **The Angle Orthodontist, 2015. 85(6): p. 911-919.**
19. Lee, K.-J., et al., *Computed tomographic analysis of tooth-bearing alveolar bone for orthodontic miniscrew placement.* **American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, 2009. 135(4): p. 486-494.**
20. Martinelli, F.L., et al., *Anatomic variability in alveolar sites for skeletal anchorage.* **American Journal of Orthodontics and**

Dentofacial Orthopedics, 2010. 138(3): p. 252.e1-252.e9.

21. Miyawaki, S., et al., *Factors associated with the stability of titanium screws placed in the posterior region for orthodontic anchorage.* **American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, 2003. 124(4): p. 373-378.**

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

Mission and Scope:
Compendium of Oral Science (Compend.Oral.Sci*), is the official journal of the Faculty of Dentistry, Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM). The goal of Compendium of Oral Science is to publish peer-reviewed, hypothesis-driven,original research articles on a broad range of topics of general interest to those working on the oral science and dentistry. The journal welcomes submissions in a wide array of subspecialties from throughout the world in achieving this goal.*

Types of Articles Published
Authors are invited to submit manuscripts for publication as Regular articles (full-length research reports), short communications, case reports, Reviews and Letters to Editors.

Regular Articles: These should describe new and carefully confirmed findings, and experimental procedures should be given in sufficient detail for others to verify the work. The length of a full paper should be the minimum required to describe and interpret the work clearly.

Short Communications: Short communications should aim at being **no longer than two printed pages**. They should contain important, new, definitive information of sufficient significance to warrant publication. Short communications need not follow the usual division into Material and Methods etc. but should have a short Abstract.

Case Reports: Illustrating unusual and clinically relevant observations are acceptable but their merit needs to provide high priority for publication in the Journal. On rare occasions, completed cases displaying non-obvious solutions to significant clinical challenges will be considered. Short papers not exceeding 1200 words, a maximum of three illustrations (with consideration to certain case reports) and five references may be accepted for publication if they serve to promote communication between clinicians and researchers.

The main text of **case reports** should be organized with Introduction, case report, discussion and conclusion.

A paper submitted as a brief clinical / case report should include the following:

- A short **introduction** (avoid lengthy reviews of literature);
- The **case report** itself (a brief description of the patient/s, presenting condition, any special investigations and outcomes);

Discussion which should highlight specific aspects of the case(s), explain/interpret the main findings and provide a scientific appraisal of any previously reported work (if any) in the field. Interpretation of their significance and to draw a **Conclusions** or generalizations about future cases when warranted by the evidence presented, or suggestion for further possible studies.

Reviews: Submissions of reviews covering topics of current interest are welcome and encouraged. Reviews should be concise and no longer than 4-6 printed pages (about 12 to 18 manuscript pages). Reviews are also peer-reviewed.

Letters to the Editor: Letters to the Editor regarding published articles should be received within 2 months of mailing of the journal, letters regarding profession related matters will also be considered. Authors are encouraged to keep letters concise and succinct, with a limit of no more than 750 words. Introduction of new data will not be permitted. Each letter will be submitted to the author of the original paper so that any reply may be published simultaneously with the letter. Letters should have a descriptive title.

Frequency: One issue a year

Manuscript Submission Process
Before submitting your manuscript to **Compendium of Oral Science (**Compend.Oral.Sci **)**, authors should be familiar with the Editorial Policies. These describe our requirements regarding human and animal research, materials and methods disclosure, and prior publication. Information regarding the expectations of reviewers and editors and the review process are also available on this page.

Letter of Transmittal
This letter must be supplied during submission. The signatures of the corresponding author is required. The letter must have following:

- **Manuscript Title:** The Author(s) name(s) (identify the corresponding author, with complete address, telephone, FAX, and e-mail information).(50 word maximum)
- **Type of Manuscript**: Regular Article, Short Communication, Case Report, Review and Letter to the Editor.
- **Brief Statement of Significance:** A statement that describes the significance of the paper.
- **Statement of Direct Participation:** statement that declares that all of the authors have directly participated in the planning, execution, or analysis of the study and resulting paper, and have read and approved the version submitted.
- **Information:** Must include information on prior or duplicate publication or submission elsewhere of any part of the work/study; and a statement of financial or other relationships that might lead to a conflict of interest. *Copies of any permission(s) to reproduce published material, and to use illustrations or report information about identifiable people must accompany the manuscript.*
- **Optional-** The contact information of any suggested reviewers (names, addresses, and e-mail).

Manuscripts submitted without a letter of transmittal will not be processed for peer review.

Licence to Publish
The corresponding author will be contacted to complete the "Compendium of Oral Science: License to Publish form" upon an editorial decision of Accept.

Upon acceptance of a paper, authors are required to assign the exclusive licence to publish their paper to the Compendium of Oral Science. Assignment of copyright is a condition of publication, and papers will not be passed to the publisher for production unless copyright has been assigned. A completed Copyright Transfer Agreement must be sent to the address specified on the agreement, before any manuscript can be published. Authors may send the completed original Copyright Transfer Agreement by fax (optional) but must be followed by mail upon receiving notice of manuscript acceptance. Do not send the Copyright Transfer Agreement at submission.

Copyright
Submission of a manuscript implies: that the work described has not been published before (except in the form of an abstract or as part of a published lecture, or thesis) that it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere; that if and when the manuscript is accepted for publication, the authors agree to automatic transfer of the copyright to the publisher.

Authorship
All persons designated as authors should qualify for authorship. The entitlement to authorship should be based on all of the following criteria: (1) substantial contributions to conceptions and design, execution or analysis and interpretation of data; (2) drafting the article or revising it for important intellectual content; (3) final approval of the version to be published. *Acquisition of funding, collection of data, or general supervision of the research group, alone, does not justify authorship.* All contributors who do not meet the criteria for authorship should be listed in the Acknowledgements. *The order of authorship should be a joint decision of the co-authors.* Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for part of the content or the whole. Corresponding author must agree that above has been confirmed by all authors when submitting a manuscript.

Originality
By submitting your manuscript to the journal it is understood that this it is an original manuscript and is unpublished work and is not under consideration elsewhere.

Conflict of Interest
The Compendium of Oral Science*'s* policy requires that each author reveal any financial interests or connections, direct or indirect, or other situations that might raise the question of bias in the work reported or the conclusions, implications, or opinions stated including pertinent commercial or other sources of funding for the individual author(s) or for the associated department(s) or organization(s), personal relationships, or direct academic competition.
As an integral part of the submission process, Corresponding authors are required to confirm whether they or their co-authors have any conflicts of interest to declare, and to provide details of these.
Any changes made to the list of conflicts after the paper is accepted must be submitted in writing, signed by the appropriate authors (that is, the corresponding author and the author for whom the conflict exists), to the *Com-*

pendium of Oral Science Editorial Office. Publication of manuscripts will be withheld until all such written approvals are received. Compendium of Oral Science accepts no responsibility for such changes.

Experimental Ethics:

- **Animal experiments:** When reporting animal experiments authors should indicate whether the institution's, national research council's, or any other law on the care and use of laboratory animals was followed.
- **Human subjects:** When reporting on human subjects, authors should indicate whether the procedures followed were in accordance with the ethical standards of the Helsinki Declaration (1964, amended most recently in 2008) of the World Medical Association. Manuscripts should include a statement that the patient's written consent was obtained and any information, including illustrations, should be as anonymized as far as possible. Authors should indicate that the design of the work has been approved by local ethical committees or that it conforms to standards currently applied in the country of origin. The name of the authorizing body should be stated in the paper.

Clinical Trials

Authors should indicate that the design of clinical trial study has been approved by local ethical committees / appropriate authority or that it conforms to standards currently applied in the country of origin. The name of the authorizing body should be stated in the paper. The clinical trial registration number and name of the trial register will then be published with the paper.

Funding

All sources of funding should be declared in the Acknowledgements. If a private/commercial sponsor supported the research, authors are advised to describe the role of the study sponsor (s), if any, in study design; in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; and in the decision to submit the paper for publication. If the funding source had no such involvement, this should be stated.

Details of all funding sources for the work in question should be given in a separate section entitled 'Funding'. This should appear before the 'Acknowledgements' section.
The following rules should be followed:

- The sentence should begin: 'This work was supported by …'
- The full official funding agency name should be given, i.e. 'National Institutes of Health', not 'NIH' (_Grant numbers should be given in brackets as follows: '[grant number xxxx]'
- Multiple grant numbers should be separated by a comma as follows: '[grant numbers xxxx, yyyy]'
- Agencies should be separated by a semi-colon (plus 'and' before the last funding agency)
- Where individuals need to be specified for certain sources of funding the following text should be added after the relevant agency or grant number 'to [author initials]'.

An example is given here: 'This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health [AA123456 to C.S., BB765432 to M.H.]; and the Alcohol & Education Research Council [hfygr667789].'

Evaluation of manuscripts

Submitted manuscripts are subject to peer review and are expected to meet standards of academic excellence. Peer-reviewers identities will remain anonymous to the authors. The Editor-in-Chief's decision regarding publication is based on the recommendation of the reports of reviewers, which will, at the Editors' discretion, be transmitted to the authors.

Authors may suggest the names and addresses of a few potential reviewers. The Editors and Associate Editors will be guided but not necessarily bound by these suggestions.

Form and Style of Manuscript

Manuscripts must be written in English. Manuscript documents should be formatted as follows:

- They should be typed on A4 form (21×29.7 cm or 21.6×28 cm)
- Double spaced
- 2.5 cm (1 inch) margins
- Justify
- Page numbers at the bottom of each page; centered or right-justified
- **11-point font**; restrict fonts to **Arial** throughout the manuscript (Use of other fonts is not recommended and could result in problems with converting your manuscript for review.)

- Avoid boldface, underlining, or italics in the manuscript

Other formatting notes:

- We do not publish Appendices.
- Do not embed figures into the manuscript. They must be uploaded as separate files for each figure.

Separate pages should be used for the following:**(1) title page (s), (2) abstract, (3) text, (4) footnote(s) to the text, (5) references, (6) table(s), (7) legend(s) to figure(s), (8) declaration of Funding and Conflict of Interest** . The manuscripts should be arranged in the order indicated above and all pages should be numbered in succession except the figure(s), **the title page being page 1.**

Indicate the appropriate location in the text of the tables, figures, and other subsidiary materials by marginal notes. Latin words should be italicized (for example: in vitro, i.e., etc., per se). Footnote(s) to the author's name (s) and affiliation(s) should appear on the title page. All footnotes should be numbered in succession with superscript, Arabic numerals, starting from the title page footnote(s). Footnotes to tables should be identified with superscript lower case (a, b, etc.), and placed at the bottom of the table. Acknowledgement (if any) should appear after the main text, and before the References. It is advised that authors note any conflict of interest in this section.

Organization of Manuscript

A desirable plan for the organization of a **Regular Paper** is as follows: **(1) TITLE (2) ABSTRACT, (3) INTRODUCTION** with no heading, **(4) MATERIALS AND METHODS (5) RESULTS (6) DISCUSSION (7) REFERENCES.**

1. Title Page

Provide a title page, containing the following items.

i) The type of paper

ii) Title. The title should be informative and as short as is consistent with clarity. The title should not include chemical formulae or arbitrary abbreviations, but chemical symbols may be used to indicate the structures of isotopically labeled compounds. The numbering of parts in a series of papers is not permitted, but titles and subtitles may be used if necessary.

iii) Next-line. List full names of all authors. A footnote reference(s) to an author(s), indicating a change of address, should be given on the title-page.

iv) Next-line. List the institution(s) in which the work was carried out, and the Zip Code / post code, if available.

v) Running title. Provide a short running title of less than 50 strokes. It should be as informative as possible.

vi) The name, complete mailing address, telephone number, Fax number, and E mail address of the person to whom correspondence should be sent. To expedite the review, much of the journal's correspondence will be by E mail.

vii) Abbreviations. Non-standard abbreviations should be defined, even if they are known to those familiar with the field. List all non-standard abbreviations used in the paper in alphabetical order in a footnote on the title page.

Customary abbreviations in wide use need not be defined in text (e.g., RNA, ATP). Define other abbreviations the first time that they are used. Refer to the Journal of Biological Chemistry for recommended abbreviations for biological compounds, Chemical Abstracts for names of chemical compounds, Conn's Biological Stains (10th Edition, RW Horobin and JA Kiernan (eds.), BIOS Scientific Publishers) for nomenclature, and the CSE Style Manual (2006, 7th ed., Council of Science Editors) for scientific abbreviations. Use SI units only. The Journal does not print the degree symbol before temperature symbols. All temperatures are printed as follows: 80C, 37.4F, 276K.

2. Abstract

i) The Abstract should ***not exceeding 250 words***. Abstract text should be divided into the following sections: **Objectives** (a brief statement of the purpose of the investigation along with the the working hypothesis)- **Materials and Methods** (A brief description of the materials and experimental method used); **Results** (state the results simply and clearly so that significant facts can be readily identified, where appropriate, statistics should be clearly stated); **Conclusions** (a brief summary of the essential results you believe were demonstrated by the experimental data and the impact of the results). Abstract should be in a form comprehensible to any scientist and suitable for publication without the full article text.

Avoid statements such as "The significance of these results is discussed" that do not help the reader. The abstract should be intelligible to the non-specialist as well as the specialist in your field, and hence should avoid

specialized terms and abbreviations.

ii) **Key words**. Provide 3-5 key words identifying the nature of the subject matter alphabetically in the last part of the summary.

3. Introduction

The main part of an article should start with a brief Introduction, which outlines the historical or logical origins of the study and clearly states the aim of the study and/or hypothesis to be tested, without repeating the abstract or summarizing the results. Avoid giving an extensive review of the literature.

4. Materials and Methods

The materials and methods section should provide a sufficient detailed description of the methods to allow a researcher to reproduce your work. Companies from which materials were obtained should be listed with their location: city and state, province or country.

The **Experimental Procedures** or **Materials and Methods** should give sufficient details to enable the reader to repeat your work exactly, if necessary. **The necessity for conciseness should not lead to omission of important experimental details**. Refer to previously published procedures employed by citation of both the original description and pertinent published modifications, and do not include extensive description unless they present substantially new modifications.

This section should present clearly but succinctly the experimental findings. Only results essential to establish the main points of the work should be included. Numerical data should be analyzed using appropriate statistical tests.

For guidelines on how to report statistical results, see Bailar, JC, Mosteller, F (1988) Guidelines for statistical reporting in articles for medical journals. Ann Intern Med, 108:266-273; Curran-Everitt, D, Benos DJ, (2004) Guidelines for reporting statistics in journals published by the American Physiological Society. J Neurophysiol, 92:669-671; Lang, TA, Secic, M (2006) How to report statistics in medicine: annotated guidelines for authors, editors and reviewers, 2nd edition, Philadelphia, PA, ACP Press; Sarter M, Fritschy JM (2008) Eur J Neurosci 28:2363-2364. compact presentation.

Experimental animals: When experimental animals are used, specify ***species, strain, sex, age, supplier, and numbers of animals*** used in total and for individual experimental conditions. The species should be identified in the Title or Abstract.

Statistical methods: A complete description of statistical methods is required.

Permissions

If all or parts of previously published illustrations are used, permission must be obtained from the copyright holder concerned. It is the author's responsibility to obtain these in writing and provide copies to the publishers.

5. Results and Statistical Analyses

The observations should be presented with minimal reference to earlier literature or to possible interpretations. The main statistical results should be reported in the Results section. The description of the statistical results should include the proper statistical term (such as the F statistic) as well as the degrees of freedom and the

P value. The description of statistical results in the figure legends should be limited to important post hoc comparisons.

Statistical methods should be described with enough detail to enable a knowledgeable reader with access to the original data to verify the reported results. When possible, findings should be quantified and appropriate measures of error or uncertainty (such as confidence intervals) given. Details about eligibility criteria for subjects, randomization and the number of observations should be included. The computer software and the statistical method(s) used should be specified with references to standard works when possible

6. Discussion

The discussion section presents the interpretation of the findings, this is the only proper section for subjective comments. The discussion section should be as concise as possible and should include a brief statement of the principal findings while avoiding repetition of statements provided in the Abstract or the Results section.

A discussion of the validity of the observations, a discussion of the findings in light of other published work dealing with the same or closely related subjects, and a statement of the possible significance of the work. Extensive discussion of the literature is discouraged.

7. References

Only published and "in press" (i.e., accepted for publication in a specific journal or book) references should appear in the reference list at the end of the paper. The latest information on "in press" references should be provided. Any "in press" references that are relevant for reviewers to see in order to make a well-informed evaluation should be included as a separate document text file along with the submitted manuscript.
References cited in the text should be numbered in parentheses with Arabic numerals in order of appearance. Be sure to verify the wording of any personal communication with the person who supplied the information and get his approval for the use of his name in connection with the quoted information. All references should be listed in numerical order typed double-spaced on a separate sheet under the heading REFERENCES.
Please note the following examples.
(1) **For a journal article:**

7. Sanger F, Nicklen S, and Coulson AR (1977) DNA sequencing with chain-terminating inhibitors. ***Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*** *USA* **74**, 5463–5467

(2) For a chapter in an edited book:

12. Messing J (1983) New M13 vectors for cloning in ***Methods in Enzymology*** (Wu, R., Grossman, L., and Moldave, K., eds.) Vol. 101, pp. 20–51, Academic Press, New York

(3) For a book by one or more authors:

15. Sambrook J, Fritsch EF, and Maniatis T (1989) ***Molecular Cloning. A Laboratory Manual*** pp. 1339–1341, Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, Cold Spring Harbor, NY

Text citations to references written by more than two authors should be styled for example as, Smith et al. In the reference list, however, the names of all authors (with initials) must be given. If an article has been accepted for publication by a journal but has not yet appeared in print, the reference should be styled as follows:

29. Tanahashi H and Ito T (1994) Molecular characterization of a novel factor recognizing the interleukin-6 responsive element. ***J. Biochem.*** **(in press)**

References should be cited in the text as follows: "The procedure used has been described elsewhere (Green, 1978),"or "Our observations are in agreement with those of Brown and Black (1979) and of White et al. (1980),"or with multiple references, in chronological order: "Earlier reports (Brown and Black, 1979, 1981; White et al., 1980; Smith, 1982, 1984).... "

The use of "in preparation" and "submitted for publication" is not allowed in the reference list.
Citation of the references written in a language which is usually unreadable for general readers and those published in a journal (or book) to which general reader could not easily access should be avoided.

8. Figure Legends:
Figure legends must be placed after the Literature Cited section. Manuscript document files lacking figure legends will not be reviewed. Do not duplicate material from the text or described in the methods in your figure legends. Indicate scale bar size if it is not indicated on the figure. Figure legends should be prepared for each figure. There should be sufficient experimental detail in the legend to make the figure intelligible without reference to the text (unless the same material has been given with a previous figure, or in the Experimental Procedures section).

- **Tables:** Tables should be self-explanatory and should not duplicate textual material. Each table must be appended to the end of the manuscript, after the Figure Legends, in either Word or Excel table format. **DO NOT** embed photographs or image files of tables. Legends or keys must accompany each table and should not be added to the Figure Legends. Tables should be numbered consecutively using Arabic numerals, and should include a brief title. Use footnotes (superscripted lower-case letters) to explain abbreviations, statistics, etc. Place explanatory matter in footnotes, not in the heading.
- **Figures:** Figures must be first cited in the manuscript in ascending numeric order. Subsequent references need not be in order, but the first citation of a figure must occur after preceding figures and before following figures (eg. Figure 2 cannot be referenced until after Figure 1 has been). Figures can be first referenced in groups or in the same figure reference (eg. Figure 1-3 or Figure 5 and 6).

9. Abbreviations
Abbreviations should be kept to an absolute minimum. Abbreviations save relatively little space but greatly diminish the readability of a manuscript. In general, abbreviations should not appear in the Abstract, and sentences that contain more than one abbreviation merit careful review. The word must always be written out in full when first used and the proposed abbreviation given in parentheses. A list of all abbreviations used in the text and their meanings must be provided (in alphabetic order).

10. Acknowledgements

A short statement about grant and other financial support should be given, along with a list of contributions from collaborators who are not co-authors (it is implicit that they agree with this mention), and a declaration of competing interests. See above under Editorial Policies for additional items to be addressed in the Acknowledgements.

11. Short Communications:
A Short Communication is suitable for recording the results of complete small investigations or giving details of new models or hypotheses, innovative methods, techniques or apparatus. The style of main sections need not conform to that of full-length papers. Short communications are 2 printed pages (about 6 manuscript pages) in length.
The word limit is 1500 words and up to 10 references, and an abstract of not more than 120 words.

E-mail Confirmation of Submission
After submission you will receive an e-mail to confirm receipt of your manuscript. If you do not receive the confirmation e-mail after three (3) working days, please check your e-mail address carefully in the system. If the e-mail address is correct please contact the editorial office.

Proofs:
Proofs (Electronic proofs) will be sent through e-mail attachment to the corresponding author by PDF wherever possible and should be returned within three (3) working days of receipt through e-mail. Corrections should be restricted to typesetting errors; any other amendments made may be charged to the author. Any queries should be answered in full. Therefore, it is important to ensure that all of your corrections are returned to us in one all-inclusive e-mail or fax. Subsequent additional corrections will not be possible, so please ensure that your first communication is complete.

Sending a Revised Manuscript
While submitting a revised manuscript, corresponding author is requested to include, along with single copy of the final revised manuscript, a scanned copy of the revised manuscript with the changes underlined in **red** and with the point to point clarification to each comment. The manuscript number should be written on each of these documents.

Reprints:
Information for ordering reprints can be obtained from the editorial office.

Manuscript Submission
All materials send to email: kazi@salam.uitm.edu.my

[Manuscript along with the "Letter of Transmittal" signed by the corresponding author (scanned copy)].

Editorial Address

Kazi Ahsan Jamil, BDS, PhD

Editor-in-Chief,
*Compendium of Oral Science (*Compend.Oral.Sci*),*
Faculty of Dentistry
UiTM Sungai Buloh Campus
Jalan Hospital,
47000 Sungai Buloh,
Selangor, Malaysia.
Tel: +603-6126 6511
Fax: +603-6126 6103
E-mail: kazi@salam.uitm.edu.my